



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/747,720

12/29/2003

Ramon M. Velez JR.

1235\_001

5879

20874 7590 05/11/2006

WALL MARJAMA & BILINSKI  
101 SOUTH SALINA STREET  
SUITE 400  
SYRACUSE, NY 13202

EXAMINER

EL ARINI, ZEINAB

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1746

DATE MAILED: 05/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/747,720	<b>Applicant(s)</b> VELEZ, RAMON M.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Zeinab E. EL-Arini	<b>Art Unit</b> 1746	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/5/05, 2/28/06.  
 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.  
     4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-20 is/are rejected.  
 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
     a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
         1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
         2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
         3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Specification***

The objection to the specification stated in paper No.090205 has been withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph stated in paper No. 090205 has been withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.

***Election/Restrictions***

Applicant's election of claims 11-20 in the reply filed on 12/05/05 is acknowledged.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buongiorno (5,679,174) in combination with Swanick (1,492,9050 or Kenton et al. (5,464,479).

Buongiorno discloses a method and apparatus for cleaning internal passageways of an airfoil (turbine blade) by inserting a tube into the internal passageway and col. 3,

line 1- col. 4, line 5, and the claims. The reference discloses all limitations with the exception of installing a plurality of parts into a holder, providing a guide member, and providing a manifold as claimed.

Swanick discloses a method and apparatus for cleaning internal surface of a component by inserting a tube inside the component and dispensing a cleaning fluid into the internal surfaces. The apparatus has a plurality of nozzles, which are connected to common manifold 3. See Figs. 1-2, and the claims. The reference discloses the installing step, the manifold, and the guide member as claimed.

Kenton et al. disclose a method for removing undesired material from internal spaces of parts (blades). The reference discloses installing a plurality of parts into a fixture, which is mounted in the flushing cabinet. The high pressure flush system comprises a cabinet, a central pump, a water source, and plurality of hoses. The attachment hoses extend from the shuttle valve through cabinet wall fittings and connect to disconnect provided on the part holding fixture. The fixture, in turn, is designated to direct water from the hoses into the internal spaces of the blade. See col. 8, line 50- col. 9, line 30, and Fig. 3.

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to use the multiple dispensing means taught by Swanick or Kenton et al. in the Buongiorno process for the purpose of treating multiple components simultaneously to reduce the treatment time and to increase the process efficiency. The references fail to disclose probes are of different length. It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time applicant invented the claimed process to utilize different size of dispensing means for the

purpose of using the process for different size of components. One would have been motivated to change the length of the tubes so that can fit different size of components or tubes and clean the internal surface.

This rejection stated in paper No. 090205 is maintained.

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 12/5/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's argument with respect to Swanick is unpersuasive, because the process as claimed does not exclude flushing the internal surface of a component.
2. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., Swanick failed to disclose clean the internal surfaces) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).
3. Applicant's argument with respect to Buongiorno in combination with Swanick and Kenton et al. is unpersuasive. This is because it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to use the multiple dispensing means taught by Swanick or Kenton et al. in the Buongiorno process for the purpose of treating multiple components simultaneously to reduce the treatment time and to increase the process efficiency. The references fail to disclose probes are of different length. Using hoses in Kenton et al. will be able to perform the same function of using the probes as claimed.

***Conclusion***

3. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zeinab E. EL-Arini whose telephone number is (571) 272-1301. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on (571) 272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1746

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Zeinab E. EL-Arini  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1746

ZEE  
05/04/06